

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR (15-0402 mmC
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEED FIRE
Speedy Trial Act from 870 , 2015 to 970	AUG 20 2015 RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERKUS DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CAUTOMA 2015, the Court excludes time under the 3 26, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § asses this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the p or law, that it is unreasonable to expe	the number of the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
<u> </u>	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, are diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
——————————————————————————————————————	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time aking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 4/20/201	JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney